



MINUTES Strategic Planning Committee

DATE	March 20, 2002
TIME	10:00 AM
LOCATION	Kinthead Building, 6 th Floor Conference Room Carson City
RECORDER	Chris Hernandez

ATTENDEES

Name	Attend ✓	Name	Attend ✓
Chair – Mike Hillerby, Governor's Office	✓	Co-Chair – Mark Blomstrom, DoIT	✓
Chuck Chinnock, Taxation	✓	Terry Savage, DoIT	✓
Jim Demme, NDOT		Scott Sisco, Cultural Affairs	✓
Myla Florence, DETR	✓	Tom Stephens, NDOT	
Sara Jones, Cultural Affairs	✓	P. Forrest Thorne, PEBS	✓
Alisanne Maffei, DoIT	✓	Doug Walther, B&I	✓
John E. Neill, NDOT	✓	Ginny Lewis, DMV	✓
Beau Pankiw, SOS		Dana Mathiesen, DMV	✓
Kathy Ryan, DoIT	✓	Freeman Johnson, CNR	

CALL TO ORDER

I Introduction

- Members introduced themselves and the agency they represent.

II Review and Approval of the Minutes.

- After review of the last minutes, it was motioned to accept the minutes and seconded. There were no other comments. The minutes from February 20, 2002, were accepted as presented.

III DISCUSSION

Charter – Version 2.1

- Mark Blomstrom introduced the current version with minor changes to wording and the inclusion of Section 4 Guiding Principles. His proposal to submit the Charter in its current version to the NITOC committee for review was agreed to by all.

Top-10 IT Issues

- Since the IT Strategic Planning Committee is considered to be that by which the other committees draw their lead, discussion led to the decision that while

the Top-10 list will require further clarification and detail to be instructional, it would be most useful to the other committees for it to be released in its present state to reveal to them what the top issues are. They can adjust their focus accordingly. Awareness of the issues may prove helpful through address in the budget process at which the State is now on the threshold.

- Chuck Chinnock of Taxation provided a memo outlining proposed wording changes for Top-10 item Optimizing IT Service: Decentralization vs. Centralization. The concern is with the “versus”. Decentralization is much more than a cost vs. benefit analysis. The success of an IT project is of equal or more importance. The benefits and opportunities offered under any of the programs or scenarios ought to be available to agencies.

The Committee agreed that there are several agencies that are decentralized and several that are centralized and each one of those are going to want to take advantage and benefits of one or the other. The acceptance of Taxation’s proposed refinement of this issue statement was moved by Mark Blomstrom, seconded by Terry Savage, and approved by all as follows:

Optimizing IT Service: Decentralization or Centralization.
Implementation of IT policies and standards to take advantage of decentralized or enterprise-wide centralized opportunities that offer the best elements of success to include cost/benefit analysis and best organizational practices.

- Discussion turned to the rest of the issues on the Top-10 list. Sara Jones of Library and Archives and Scott Sisco of Cultural Affairs raised the concern that there wasn’t enough direction included in the definitions. They posed the question to the committee whether there was enough description provided for each issue to convey the meaning and intent of the committee to others not involved in the strategic planning process.

The consensus was that the IT Strategic Planning Committee has already put forth a concerted effort to narrow the Top-10 list to simple yet concise statements of the issues with ranked importance. Putting too much direction into them may reveal a duplication of effort when finally reviewed with the other committees. All agreed that it would be best to submit the Top-10 list to NITOC for review and to have the other committees report their goals and progress to the IT Strategic Planning Committee to see how they compare to the issues identified on the Top-10 list. There may be some feedback from the goals and objectives from the other committees that may be used to flesh-out the descriptions on the Top-10 list.

Kathy Ryan suggested that the feedback from the other committees might reveal issues on the Top-10 list that aren’t being addressed by the other committees. Whether there are gaps needs to be known. Woody Thorne also pointed out that the feedback might also reveal whether any of the Top-10 issues fall outside of the areas of responsibility of all of the committees as a whole.

Myla Florence, DETR, and Woody Thorne, PEBP, proposed that three questions be asked of the committees when the current draft version of the Top-10 list is submitted to them for review:

1. What issues is each of the committees addressing?
2. What concerns does each committee have about those issues?
3. Explain how what they are working on ties into any or all of the Top-10 issues that we have identified.

All in the committee agreed that as soon as a cover memo could be prepared stating the purpose of the Charter and the Top-10 IT Issues list as draft, all three items would be delivered to the other committees for review.

· Research Summary Results – IT Equipment Replacement Schedules

Mark Blomstrom recapped the DoIT user definition for replacement schedule purposes from Policy, Standards and Procedures 6.0 Classification of Technology Users.

1. The leading edge power users - 2-3 years replacement
2. The mainstream users - every 4 years replacement
3. The conservative or the green screeners - 5-6 years replacement

Terry Savage, DoIT, related a practice that is being tried in national government of getting away from the purchase model entirely, and going to a lease model. A percentage of the leased machines get updated every three years, another percentage every four years, another percentage every five years. That is one way to get completely out of the purchasing notion. It becomes more like paying the electric bill. That is actually consistent with the way that the software industry is going. It would be one way to get out of that box of how often to replace. There is an ongoing lease agreement for the utility of PC equipment. The lease agreement binds an acceptable replacement schedule written into the terms.

It would solve the problem that we see, particularly for small agencies. The agency has a lease agreement that replaces its PC equipment every so often, but the payments are constant. The operating expense is in the budget. Due to inflation it may go up, but not spike all over the place. That brings some stability to the whole process.

If done as a statewide lease it could provide a much stronger position maintaining that lease and allow the agencies to access that master lease on the replacement schedule.

Although this concept would be a large undertaking for this committee to start proposing to the Legislature, the consensus was that the beginning of this budget cycle is the time to present the concept with the notion that the research is going to be conducted. This may be an issue that if there is significant cost benefit to take to IFC.

All members were significantly impressed with John Neill's suggestion that a pilot program might be conducted by agencies such as NDOT that already spends quite a bit every year and might be able to get one of those leases going under the current budget that wouldn't require Legislative approval. Scott Sisco took the idea a step further and proposed having those participating agencies funding a statewide project where the equipment is leased to the project. The money becomes a revolving fund.

Mark Blomstrom, DoIT, volunteered to put together a proposal to research the possibility of finding the right agency to start a pilot program that could maybe phase in one or two more. While the pilot is underway, additional information about cost savings, lease verses capital outlay and annual depreciation that could result in significant savings information, and studies from other state governments can be compiled for complete presentation to the Legislature.

With enthusiastic agreement from all on the committee, it was decided to proceed with the steps necessary to begin a campaign to raise the consciousness level of the Legislature and state government to the idea of lease expenditures for information technology hardware and software replacement schedules on a statewide basis.

· IT Training

It is documented that various of the larger agencies are funded for training and have been conducting IT training, but Ginny Lewis, DMV, pointed out that the training that is being conducted is not at all coordinated to encourage other agencies to occupy extra seats.

Previous discussion on IT training exposed the lack of coordination in publishing the information on a statewide basis, coordinating a schedule, and a mechanism for making payment.

WGU might be called upon to assist in the notification/coordination of scheduled workshops. Sara Jones suggested that the State Library might be able to assist in offering a centralized training location away from the work place in which to conduct in-house and/or distance training.

Item 7 on the Top-10 IT Issues list identifies that this is one of the areas of high priority and discussion has taken place regarding a coordinator, but the IT Workforce Committee is addressing this issue. It was decided to delegate this topic to them.

IV WRAP UP

· Mark Blomstrom and the IT Strategic Planning Committee staff will coordinate the calendar with those of the various other committees under NITOC for those committees to review the IT Strategic Planning Committee Charter and Top-10 IT Issues list and to report back to this committee. The next meeting of the IT Strategic Planning Committee will be set according to that outcome and members will be notified. It will probably not be until May 2002.

ACTION ITEMS

Item No.	Description	Assigned To
1.	Forward the Charter V2.1 to the various committees, Nevada IT Oversight Committee (NITOC), E-Gov Steering Committee, Security Committee, Technical Standards & Architecture Committee, IT Work Force Committee, Electronic Records Management Committee, Justice IT Integration Committee, IT Project Oversight Committee,	Mark Blomstrom, Alisanne Maffei
2.	Incorporate wording change submitted by Chuck Chinnock, Taxation, to Item 3 of the Top-10 IT Issues list.	Mark Blomstrom
3.	Forward the Top-10 IT Issues list as draft to NITOC and the various committees.	Mark Blomstrom, Alisanne Maffei
4.	Create a proposal to draft a pilot program and research into lease agreement providing IT hardware, software, and periodic replacement on a statewide basis for submittal to the Legislature.	Mark Blomstrom, Alisanne Maffei
5.	Forward Item 7 <u>IT Training</u> , on the Top-10 IT Issues list specifically to the IT Work Force Committee for review and report.	Mark Blomstrom, Alisanne Maffei
6.	Coordinate the calendars of the committees under NITOC after review of Charter V2.1 and Top-10 IT Issues list for reports to IT Strategic Planning Committee of issues and goals. Arrange for next meeting in May 2002.	Mark Blomstrom, Alisanne Maffei